

**MINUTES**  
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
OF THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON HOMELAND SECURITY  
Sep 29, 2004

---

**AGENDA ITEM #1 CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL.** - Mr. Hadfield mentioned that Mr. Lowden may be moving and this might be his last meeting, and he thanked him for his service. Ms Gwendolyn Hadd conducted roll call, which established a quorum was available for the meeting. [meeting started at 8:56:26 - by LCB computer time]

| Name                           | Present | Absent | Remarks    |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------|------------|
| Mr. Robert Hadfield, Chairman  | P       |        |            |
| Dr. Dale Carrison              | P       |        |            |
| Mr. Chuc Lowden                | P       |        |            |
| Ms. Kimberly McDonald          | P       |        |            |
| Mr. James Spinello             | P       |        |            |
| Mr. Bill Young                 | P       |        |            |
| Mr. Glade Myler, Legal Council | P       |        | Non-Voting |

Mr. Hadfield congratulated Mr. Dale Carrison on his appointment as the Chairman of the Homeland Security Commission, and asked him if he would like to address the assembly.

Dr. Carrison thanked members for their hard work. From the reports in the media and other sources everyone knows that this will be a leaner and meaner Commission. He does not view this as a start over, there was a lot of good work by the old commission and he wants the new commission to build on that. He wants to have the quarterly meetings and not have too many meetings. He realizes that Commission members have busy lives outside of the Commission. The work of the committees is incredibly important. The committees have been working during this interim time. Some people would like to say that we haven't been doing anything, when we have clearly have been accomplishing a number of things with the committee, particularly with the Finance Committee and the By-Laws and Legislative Committee. We'll see that as the Commission meets as a full session and goes forward with recommendations and idea promulgated by these committees. He thanked the new members and thanked the members who are no longer on the Commission for their hard work in the past. Jim Spinello has joined us on the Finance Committee and with Bob's consent he asked Jim to be the Vice-Chair of the Finance Committee. Jim has graciously accepted. Dr. Carrison appreciates everyone here. This is for the betterment of the State of Nevada. It is for the health and safety of our people. It's our mission to determine the allocation of resources for the most efficient use for the health and safety of Nevada. Dr. Carrison thanked Chairman Hadfield.

Mr. Hadfield introduced Major General Giles Vanderhoof as the new Homeland Security Administrator and invited his to speak.

General Vanderhoof thanked Chairman Hadfield for the opportunity to make a few remarks. He agrees with everything the Chairman Carrison

stated. Things will be a little bit different with current changes in the Commission. He was a Commission member before, but is not on the Commission now, however he will be working very closely with the Commission. One goal he has is to get staff to support both the Commission and the Homeland Security Office. General Vanderhoof will be going around meeting people in Southern Nevada and the Reno/Carson City areas and some of the outlying counties. He sees the Homeland Security mission as a collaborative partnership that will have members working together, and he wants to get a feel for what some of the concerns are. He would like to get people involved in a couple of the other immediate goals he has. Several plans the state needs to get into Department of Homeland Security are delinquent. He has straw men being drafted and he will be asking for people from some of the larger agencies to help flesh out those plans. Then he will bring those back to the Commission for them to review, make recommendations and to approve the plans. He intends to work with the Commission, emergency management, the public safety people, and the first responder community. None of this will be hampered by his duties as the Adjutant General. He is sure it will work out fine if we all work together and look at this as a partnership and support each other. Then we will be successful. He looks forward to working with the Commission.

Mr. Hadfield thanked General Vanderhoof for his comments. Then he thanked Gwen Hadd for manning the Carson City Homeland Security office single handedly. He then asked that members be a little more formal when making motions so the recorder can annotate exactly what the motion is, who made it, who seconded it, and what the vote was. He mentioned the importance to have the meeting where most of the commissioners are [Las Vegas].

**AGENDA ITEM #2 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 12, 2004 MEETING (Discussion/Action).** Corrections to the meeting were:

Page 1 - no changes

Page 2 - "Ms McDonald" not "Chairman McDonald"

Line 8 - she objected to only receiving spreadsheets/applications handouts without description explanations

Page 3 - Line 11 - Mr. McDonald was really Mr. Tim McAndrew

Page 4 - Line 14 - local site not local side

Page 5 - Line 16 - Mr. Lopey made that statement

Page 6 - Line 1 - Chief Mike Mayberry made that statement.

Page 7 - none

Page 8 - none

Line 28 - Kimberly made that question.

Line 35 - Seconded by Chuc Lowden.

Line 39 - Mr. Dan Shirely

Pg 4, Line 18 - Sheriff Young

Line 22 Kimberly McDonald seconded.

Line 31 -- Sheriff Young

Line 43-- Jim Lopey

MOTION: Sheriff Young moved to accept minutes as amended.

SECONDED: Ms. McDonald

DISCUSSION: Dr. Carrison noted that those things that still remain unintelligible [in the minutes] were not unintelligible at the time of the meeting, and that we will make all efforts in the future not to have unintelligible portions of the minutes.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hadfield stated that he appreciated everyone's patience with this process. He assured everyone that this last minute arrival of the minutes is not normal. Both he and the Chairman of the Homeland Security Commission want handouts to commissioners well in advance of meetings.

**AGENDA ITEM #3 FINANCE COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP.  
(Discussion/Action), Mr. Glade Myler.**

Mr. Hadfield mentioned to the audience that this group [Finance Committee] is smaller and asked Glade Myler to explain what prompted the changes.

Mr. Myler mentioned that there have been some changes in the Homeland Security Commission. It is smaller and there were two opinions: one that the Open Meeting Law must be followed, and the second is that committee members must be from the Commission. In other words, members of the Commission must serve on the committees. That does not mean that the committees cannot use non-members for informational and evidentiary purposes. They can come to committee meetings, present evidence or information you may need to make recommendations to make to the full commission. But as far as sitting on the committees, the opinion that was given on Jun 22, 2004 indicates that only members of the Commission can be on the committees. With the change in the way we are doing business and the numbers and so on it is important that members of the committee be there. One of the issues being dealt with by the By-Laws Committee is voting by proxy. At this point that cannot happen because that is allowed in statutes where it is delineated, that the commission may vote by proxy. Right now that is not possible [for this commission]. Chairman McDonald's Legislative Committee is working on a bill draft submitted to the legislature. In that bill draft there will be a suggestion that proxy voting be allowed. Members of that committee have also expressed a desire that the committee members be dedicated and that they can miss, maybe, two meetings for excused absences. So those are a couple of the things that have changed since that last meeting. If you recall, I was not at the last meeting Mr. Michael Saams took my place. Mr. Saams is very competent and is my backup in any case when I cannot be here. He is also from our office. He and I receiving the same training we are making sure we have a backup. That's very important in Homeland Security dealings because in emergencies, as we know, we need a backup. We are also, in our office [Attorney General's Office] are sponsoring a Legal Preparedness Table Top Exercise that will take place on Nov 18<sup>th</sup>. Anybody in the entire state who could possibly play or be involved will be there with their backups to play in that tabletop exercise. There will be members from Supreme Court, District Courts; judges from Clark County, Washoe County and also some of the 'cow counties,' deputy district attorneys, city attorney's and their backups, and a number of members from our office that are involved with a number of legal issues on a terrorist type activity. It will take place on Nov 18<sup>th</sup>. It will be down here in Clark County preliminarily at the Suncoast Hotel. Any of you who would like to be there as observers, are certainly welcome. Mr. Sandoval will take an active part in that at that time. Another informational item for this committee, which will be important, ODP [Office of Domestic Preparedness] has indicated that if the states do not have an intra-mutual assistance agreement in place in the next year or so, our funding will be cut some. For that reason NEMAC [Nevada Emergency Management Assistance Compact] has been prepared. Clark County did a draft of it. The Division of Emergency Management and I have gone over it and there have been some revisions of it. When it is

at the point where we think it should be sent to all of the counties, and to the cities, that will be involved in emergency assistance, it will be recommended to be adopted throughout the whole state. I will be sending the letters out from my office to the different entities. When the counties receive those, I have offered to be at the Clark County Board of Commissioners [meeting] and Washoe County's meeting, to explain what is going on and explain the agreement. Of course we recognize that councils for the cities and counties may want to go over that proposed agreement and have their input on it. Once that has happened all the entities have signed off and adopted it, then we will be in compliance. That should be coming out in the next couple of weeks. Those are the main things that I see have taken place. The important thing is that composition of the committees and also the open meeting law and that we have a little tighter rein on agenda and the minutes. I also think that Chairman Carrison and Chairman Hadfield have both recognized that.

Mr. Hadfield asked if any committee members had questions of Glade.

Mr. Spinello asked Glade if they are going out to the respective managers of the counties and the cities?

Mr. Myler responded that they would be going out to the chairman of the board of commissioners, and to the mayor of the city.

Mr. Hadfield asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Myler. [no one responded] Mr. Hadfield remarked this item was for discussion/information only so no vote was necessary.

**AGENDA ITEM #4 STATUS REPORT ON HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2002-04 (Discussion Only)** - Mr. Frank Siracusa, Division of Emergency Management and the State Administrative Agent for Homeland Security Funds. Overview of grant distribution, report on unexpended grant funds and distribution of residual funds.

Mr. Hadfield stated that during his tenure on the Commission he knows a great deal of effort was spent channeling money down to as many jurisdictions as possible for those who qualified for funding. His personal opinion is that we tried to push an awful lot of stuff through a very small funnel and as a result we have identified some difficulties that we have. Remembering we are only advisory to the Commission, we must take a look at this process and see how we can, if you will, mature with the time. When you take a lot of money and try to push it through a funnel all kinds of things happen and they are outside the control of anybody, so he was not being critical. He asked Frank, on today's agenda, to provide the committee a couple of things. DEM's role is to provide the committee with information. Mr. Hadfield didn't feel comfortable that he had all the information or understood all the information in the past. So he asked Frank to go over some things that will be repetitious to some, however there is at least one new member and that will be new information for him. Mr. Hadfield also stated that he asked Frank to be brutally frank with the committee about unintended consequences. Mr. Hadfield would like the Finance Committee to shift from a role of simply shoving a lot of money out there. He wants to continue to send money out, but also to move more into the accountability end. To make sure we all know the results of what we are doing, which requires more work, obviously. Mr. Hadfield pointed out that farther down the agenda are more updates and don't blame the Division of Emergency Management for this. Mr. Hadfield feels that the Finance Committee needs to fully understand the process and if there are any corrections that they might want to consider ways to make the process better. He asked Frank to throw out issues and

give the Finance Committee the opportunity to look at them and see if they can enhance them in any way, or frankly, to make their [DEM's] jobs easier. It is not in a critical role, it just seems a logical transition of this Committee. As the state has grown and has begun to increase the State's readiness capabilities Mr. Hadfield thinks we are moving forward. He knows that the Chairman of the Commission has already alluded to that [fiscal accountability] a little bit.

Mr. Siracusa, thanked the Mr. Hadfield, and greeted the Commission Chairman and committee members, and introduced himself. He then introduced Kamala Carmazzi, Deputy Director of the Division of Emergency Management, as she was intimately involved in the grant process. "We have prepared at the request of bob Hadfield spreadsheets that delineate the open grants that start in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 02, FFY 03 Phase I and 03 Phase II. These particular spreadsheets that we provided today, do not reflect FFY 04 grant dollars that this commission awarded several months back. They are based on a quarterly basis. And what I would like to say before I get into the spreadsheets in a little bit is that these particular spreadsheets, even though the date on the top of spreadsheet shows Sep 20, 2004, they really are reflective as of Jun 30<sup>th</sup>. That was the end of that particular quarter. This quarter is just ending, actually, tomorrow. So there are several more transactions and processes that have taken place, but are not reflected on these particular spreadsheets. What we are going to do, on a quarterly basis, as we receive the quarterly reports, and as we reimburse back to the sub-grantee, we will make sure that we put together a spreadsheet and we will provide that spreadsheet to this body and to the full commission. So what you are looking at here is a breakout of the grant funding, the performance periods, the dollars that were awarded, and what was expended, even though it shows as of 8/31/2004, it really is as of Jun 30<sup>th</sup>. We provided these summaries so you can take a look and kind of see where the dollars are going. We've broken those out by - the first set is of local jurisdictions, here in Clark County we broke it out to the cities and some of the disciplines and throughout the state. We also have a spreadsheet that breaks out funding, also, to state agencies broken down by state agency. And again, as you go through these spreadsheets, you will see that in some cases the total is 100% unexpended. Bear in mind that there are a lot of items that are out to bid, we have not yet receive the reimbursement claims, and right now we are at the end of the quarter. So just keep that in mind. Also, we have the tribal nations and the dollars that were allocated. You will also see the performance periods and along side the performance periods if an extension was granted. We granted extensions here in Clark County, some of the tribal nations, and some of the counties up north. And that is an issue that we certainly want to discuss, down in Agenda Item #6. We want to talk about extensions, and the importance of the extensions, and also the concerns that we have in granting extensions, because there we run the risk, that if the monies are not expended at the end of the extension we may face the possibility of having to return funds because we don't have a whole lot of time. The performance periods in each of grant cycles in two years, so you also will see on the spreadsheets that a lot of these overlap. The reason they overlap because we, the state, actually received four grant cycles within an 11-month period. So even though it was 02, and 03 and 03-Phase I, we received those all within 11-month period, so the performance periods overlap on all of those. But that is just kind of a very general overview to get kind of a window of where the dollars were allocated to and what percentage of those dollars have been expended, what particular sub-grantees have

been granted an extension, and where they sit right now. Again, as of tomorrow, the close of this particular quarter and throughout the month of October we will be compiling the data coming in from the counties for re-imbursement. Then we can develop a new spreadsheet, which we can get back out to this body, which would be more reflective of as to where we are with the particular numbers. So that is kind of just an update on previous grants and where they are at. I will be happy to take any questions, and any particular revisions you would like for these spreadsheets we would be happy to do that. This was just our first cut, so we want to make sure this works for everybody.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you, Frank. Before we open it up to questions I just have a question. The Federal Fiscal Year ends at the end of this month?

Mr. Siracusa, "Yes."

Mr. Hadfield, "does that impact us in any way on the grant..."

Mr. Siracusa, "No, no, no. The performance periods do not fall in line with the Federal Fiscal Year. What happens is, as we get into the 05 dollars, the performance period for the 05 dollars will not start until the State of Nevada gets an actual notice of grant award, and that grant award may not come 'til November or December. From that point on we have a two-year performance period. What we have been doing, and this is an issue that we want to discuss with this committee is we have been allowing a one year performance period for the sub-grantees. Even though we have a two-year performance period on the entire grant, we do one-year performance periods to the sub-grantees. The reason we do that is so that by the end of that year, if a particular sub-grantee has not obligated all those dollars, this committee then has the opportunity to go back, take a look at those dollars and reallocate those dollars out to another political subdivision. It gives us that flexibility. So that is the issue I was talking about. On the downside of allowing an extension, when we allow an extension, it cuts back on that time frame. So if we allow a 6-month extension, now we are a year and a half into a two-year performance period and it doesn't give us a whole lot of time if we have reallocate the dollars."

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you Frank. We want to make sure that the report, as Frank indicated, is meaningful to you. And we welcome your comments if you would like to see some additional information. It's simply to give the members of the Finance Committee some idea, al be it lump sum, of where we are. So I open it up to Committee members questions of Frank on this item."

Ms McDonald, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Siracusa you stated that some of these allocations were at 100%, so they haven't been distributed yet? Is that correct?"

Mr. Siracusa, "Well, what I meant was, all of these dollars, based on the Federal Cash Management Act, are on a re-imbursement basis only. So if we show 100% unexpended, that could mean several things. One - a lot of the requests for purchases of equipment, through different vendors, through different purchasing agencies for different communities may not have gotten through the system yet, and therefore, those dollars have not been expended. Or - we have not yet received the reimbursement claims from the sub-grantee. So as far as our records show, we have 100%, even though the jurisdiction may not have gotten the information to us."

Ms. McDonald, "Right. My concern is you also stated about the bidding process and so forth, which could potentially jeopardize our process, as well. Overall, is what I am getting at."

Mr. Siracusa, "What I was saying that because of the bidding process, for state and local governments, the timeline process does not allow us a whole lot of time to get someone else's bid and do everything else, in those time frames. Yes, that does present a problem. And, that was identified as a problem by Secretary Ridge's committee, who took a look at grant funding process, and how the entire process nationwide has improved. One of the areas of concern in that report was the fact that local bidding laws and purchasing requirements really impede the process. Also, dealing with the Cash Management Act. One of the recommendations of that particular committee was to make some change to some of the requirements, particularly to not have the Cash Management Act apply to Homeland Security Grant dollars."

Ms McDonald, "So these applicable entities need to expedite their process."

Mr. Siracusa, "Absolutely"

Ms. Ms McDonald, "So they need to be formally notified in some fashion?"

Mr. Siracusa, We are in continuous communication with our counties and local governments. For example, Clark County's numbers are a reflection as of June 30. Between June 30 and the close of this particular quarter, a tremendous amount of activity has occurred here in Clark County. A lot of the problem is identifying the equipment and things that needs to be purchased, getting bids, all the bureaucracy we have to deal with both at the local government, and state government level take time. It is not an easy process, to say you have been granted a million dollars and you can start buying it. It is not that easy. What we are trying to do, is not to be critical of anyone, we want this Committee to be aware of the funding that is out there and exactly where we are. Unfortunately these particular spreadsheets do not reflect where we are because of the scheduling of this meeting and the closing of this quarter happening tomorrow. Next month updated spreadsheets will be available which will more reflective of where we are."

Ms. Clark, "Thank you, and I think this edifies and substantiates the Lingering issue that we need to get to the criteria for the funding distribution."

Mr. Carrison, "One of my concerns and a question to you, is when does the grant cycle for applications for the 05 money begin?"

Mr. Siracusa, "I wish I had a crystal ball and could answer for you, we do not know. Congress needs to determine what will be allocated to the states for Homeland Security. There are different version of the Homeland Security bills in the House and Senate. We don't really know, we are not hearing anymore than you folks are hearing as to exactly how much money the states will get and how the funding will be based. Whether there will be a substantial increase in the Urban Area grant funding, which we are hearing that is probably the direction it is going to go. Whether there will be a reduction in the Homeland Security grant program, whether the programs are going to be similar to that they were in the 04 cycle. Really don't know yet, how that is going to play. What we want to accomplish today with this Committee is to set the ground rules and set the criteria so when we prepare application packages, the application package clearly delineates the criteria that has been documented by this body as to the criteria the subgrantees are going to follow in both putting the applications together and also administering those dollars. That is what we want to accomplish today, and establish that criteria, which we will get to in a few minutes. So we can put that in the application so that when the State is officially notified of a grant award, what we

typically do is when we are first notified of an availability of funding, the Federal government will tell us, based on whatever formula they use this particular 05 year, the State of Nevada is eligible for X millions of dollars in these categories. We will automatically notify the local governments and subgrantees and make them aware of that. And when we officially get an official notice of grant award, the clock starts ticking at that point and that is when the two-year performance period starts and we have that 60-day turn around. And, incidentally, there is some legislation that is looking to reducing that 60 day back to a 45 day, I'm not sure that is going to happen in 05 but it certainly may happen in future years. As soon as we get that word, we get that word out to local governments. It is usually it is press released through Tom Ridge's shop, so everybody gets the information at the same time. The clock starts ticking and then we start the application process."

Mr. Carrison, "Then, the follow up question in regards to that, and with the understanding with the 05 monies then, 05 money applications following the ground rules set by the federal government and then our ground rules, in my opinion as the Chairman, there needs to be some connection between the previous monies granted the 05 monies, in that, I am still not comfortable, as the newly appointed Chairman of the Commission, and also as a member of the State Homeland Security Finance Committee, what happened to that money, and how did that make it better for the people of Nevada. There have been a number of dollars spent, millions of expenditures, for things I clearly questioned previously as a Commission member. I want to see some connection between previous grants and performance, and how those monies were expended in the granting of future funds. As a statement and seeking your guidance with regard to that because we are going to have that information from those entities that received the funding. I want to know how that money was spent and how that improved the safety and security of the people of that area of Nevada that were granted those resources.

Mr. Hadfield, " I take that we can certainly address in the agenda coming up. Any other questions?

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, "I'm just going to state the obvious, for purposes of presentation just in case someone came in and picked up those documents you may want to put expenditures as of 6/30 to make it very clear.

Mr. Siracusa, " Certainly, the timing of this meeting prior to the end of the quarter did not allow us to provide you with more accurate information"

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, "As I understand the reporting requirements. You actually will not see the numbers that will be effective tomorrow until the end of October."

Mr. Siracusa, "Absolutely, so it would probably be sometime in early of November that we would actually be able to have an updated spreadsheet reflecting where we were as of the end of September, and that would not be 100% because new activity will take place early in October. We will never be right on the money, just some kind of a road map of where we stand with the money today.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, "To dispel any fears, at least for the Southern part of the State, I know personally in terms of the County because I have to sign for purchases, a lot of the money has been spent in the last couple of months. I am sure that is the case, just from what we are hearing among the other counties in Nevada.



Mr. Siracusa, "Is there anything we can add to these particular spreadsheets? Is this format fine for everybody? Because if it is, this is the format we will continue to use.

Mr. Hadfield, "Comments from the Committee, I'd like to get them to Frank today if we can rather than saying give him a call because then something shows up and we do not know what happened. I think this is an excellent first start. I think that it is information that is helpful. Just to identify the problems so that we are aware, like purchasing, because we may get questions. I think it is good for us to understand how this funnel is working, in fact we may want to see how some purchasing laws if it turns out there is specialized equipment. I know they changed some laws were changed for law enforcement changes to accommodate a more urgent need. Any comments on the spreadsheet or suggestions, any questions Frank. Chuck I will catch you. If you have a question I assume you will waive your hand or something."

Mr. Chuc Lowden, "Make noise if it is my turn. One of the questions that I have of Frank, the first county on local jurisdictions is Churchill County. It shows no extension past the one-year. I assume that is a one year required extension. Does that mean that with not extension and with them being past the first year, the money is available for the other counties for distribution?"

Mr. Siracusa, "Yes, it would."

Mr. Lowden, "Thank you"

Mr. Hadfield "Any other questions or for Frank on agenda item 4?"

Mr. Siracusa; "Bob, I would like to just add, again after this meeting and after you have time to digest this particular spreadsheet, if you come up with other suggestion, or ideas, ways to improve it, please feel free to give me a call or Kamala. We are here to work for you and to try to get the most information to you in the easiest way we can in a very cumbersome process."

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you Frank, I Invite you to conclude agenda item 4 and ask you to go on to agenda Item 5 Review of Grant Funding Formula. Some of this information will be old information but I think it is useful to remind us all of where we are and how we got there."

Mr. Siracusa "Thank you Mr. Chairman. As we get ready to look at the 05 and how this Committee wants to fund the 05 dollars. I want to take opportunity to recap the funding formula that was established by the Commission for the 04 dollars. Please interrupt me if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. On the State Homeland Security programs, remember fiscal year 04 there were actually four programs that came in to Nevada, the State Homeland Security grant program, the Law Enforcement program, the Citizen Corps program, and the Urban Area Initiative. It was the recommendation of the Commission to base funding to the Counties based on population and a \$25,000 base. Every County in the State will receive a base amount of \$25,000 and the remaining funding distributed to the counties based on population. The residual funding distributed by population, excluding the counties fully funded or not participating. For the Tribal Nations, the Commission agreed to withhold 2% of the Homeland Security grant program allocated to the Tribal Nations. The Tribal that submitted and had approved applications, were given a \$25,000 base, the same as the counties, and the remainder was distributed among the Tribes that participated in the program."

Mr. Hadfield "The \$25,000 did that come out of the 2%?"

Mr. Siracusa "Yes, there are approximately 29 tribes in Nevada, and three applied for grant dollars. The \$25,000 was a base and the remainder divided among the participants."

Mr. Hadfield "One other question. When we purchase something for a Tribal Nation, they have equipment, now when it comes to emergency response is there some other protocol, I know what happens with local governments, the sheriffs have inter local agreements with the cities, where do tribes stand, as the Chairman said building an overall capability. How do we access their resources if needed, do we have inter local agreements or is there a State Master agreement?"

Mr. Siracusa "There is no State master agreement. My opinion, and this is only my opinion, I think they should be part of and follow the same rules we all are bound to. The Tribes are treated, in the distribution of these grants, the same as county government. The federal government is requiring Tribal government to enter into inter local agreements as part of the NIMS process over the next couple of years. We should certainly have the tribal nations participating in the same inter local agreements."

Mr. Hadfield "Sheriff, do you have local agreements with the tribes in the area. I know they are sovereign Nations. I'm trying to get a handle on that. It seems to me we are investing some of the overall resources. I am not complaining about that. It is simply a matter of accountability. I know we purchases some major equipment, we should be able to use it beneficially. How can we access it? I do not know what the local process is."

Sheriff "We do have some inter local agreements with the tribes. Although most of the agreements relate to law enforcement services, the actual investigation of crime and arrests. It is very complicated in some cases as to who has jurisdiction, depending on the race of the individual and where the law enforcement action takes place. To my knowledge, and I defer to Bill Conger on this, I don't believe the tribal nations, with Metro in any way, have inter local agreements related to response to Emergency situations regarding homeland security. They pretty much do their own thing. How those resources are being used, in Clark County, is pretty much up to the tribes. It is somewhat unfortunate, but they have a lot of autonomy, by law."

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you Sheriff for clearing that for me."

Mr. Dale Carrison "Frank you mentioned NIMS, have we, the State adopted it? Do we need to adopt it? Where are we on that?"

Mr. Siracusa "We are just now reviewing the documentation and all the criteria for NIMS. There will be a two-year period for states to adopt the entire NIMS process. The entire NIMS process includes incident command and mutual aid. It is a very comprehensive process. We are in the process through DEM, I am working with General Vanderhoof to adopt that at the State level and I am working with local jurisdictions in adopting the NIMS system. It is going to be partial in federal fiscal year 05 and full compliance with NIMS will take place in federal fiscal year 06 to be eligible for funding in fiscal year 07."

Mr. Carrison "That was my next question. I think it is very important, because I do not know if everyone knows what the National Incident Management System is. How will it affect each of the jurisdictions? My concern is that everybody has to be on board on this in the State or we do not get funding. Are you and your office the leader in getting the information?"

Mr. Siracusa "We are going to be coordinating with the Homeland Security office in getting training on NIMS and its criteria. In getting support those local governments in developing a NIMS system in their counties. Like I said, it is more than NIMS, it is incident command, it is a broad spectrum of issues that formulate the NIMS system. There is a lot of work that needs to be done and our agency

will work in concert with Clark County and Homeland Security to ensure we become a NIMS compliant state."

Mr. Myler "Chairman that is the reason why NEMAC needs to be adopted by all the cities and counties."

Mr. Siracusa "Yes, that is one component of it."

Mr. Hadfield "is that something that we can encourage. I know you and I have discussed it in regards to Counties. Mr. Spinnello alluded to the fact he wanted to know where it goes. I hate to say it, but sometimes, stuff goes into the big black hole. No matter what our intentions are. Maybe, Jim you can get with Glade and Sheriff you too. I am not suggesting that if you send something to County Commissioners nothing happens. What I am suggesting sometimes it goes to a Secretary that the Commissioner does not see for two weeks in some of the areas. It ends up at the bottom of the basket. Sometimes the first thing we see is the last thing that came in. When we really should see the stuff that came in the day after we left first so we are in the right order we are always in the reverse order."

Sheriff Young "I would agree with that Bob, and just Metro is in a Unique position, we are neither City nor County we are our own political subdivision by law. I hear people talking about sending things to mayor or county commissioners, that does not cut it with METRO via those, because we do not get all the time. We are a unique political subdivision of the State and I appreciate being on the list. We get left out of federal things because they do not quite understand that in Washington D.C. They will send something to a mayor or county commissioner and it has caused us some grief in several occasions."

Mr. Hadfield " Glade, maybe we can do that, I understand it is a little bit more work but a cover letter saying it has been sent to whomever in your County to make sure you know so you can follow up with them. It is obviously critical that legal counsel in various political subdivisions look at this. I also know that sometimes that takes a lot longer than most people might imagine."

Mr. Myler "Any help I can get from any of the members here, in commenting to their jurisdictions that is coming, would be a lot of help. I plan to follow up personally on each of those to make sure I know they got them and to make sure I am available to come to their meetings and explain to them. The letter explains that it is important that we adopt it in order to continue receiving funding from ODP. I hope that raises a red flag from everybody. It could go to the bottom of the barrel."

Mr. Carrison "It will be a key to the funding process and if the funding process is to go forward, talking about the 06 and 07 monies, that is not long. This needs to be adopted, not only by the State but by all jurisdictions in the State and I can foresee that if you delay and not adopt it then you are going to be left out of the distribution."

Mr. Hadfield " perhaps I may suggest in your role as Chairman of the Commission that you could also send a letter urging and making everyone aware of the issue. I also want to make sure Chuck has a chance to comment. Chuck, are you all by yourself up there is there anyone in the audience?"

Mr. Lowden, "I have a wonderful peanut gallery that is sitting back there making faces once in a while to make sure that I smile and you do not know what I am smiling about."

Mr. Hadfield "We welcome everyone to the meeting. Thanks to the audience for coming. Any comments Chuck?"

Mr. Lowden, "I again, support having as many people notified as possible on that NEMAC adoption process. It is not a matter about

adopting NIMS; it is understanding what it is all about and at least committing to follow the guidelines that are contained within the National Incident Management System. The suggestion I would make is, we have a number of statewide organizations that are involved in emergency response, both police and fire public safety specifically. Perhaps they would be available to present that to a number of local fire districts, I heard the rural counties mentioned earlier for both police and fire districts to push that in their jurisdictions. This would cause this issue to be raised to a higher level than just sending it to an elected county official, who may not have any idea what the consequences would be.

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you Chuck. Frank, Sheriff Young wanted to make a comment about the funding formula."

Mr. Siracusa "Sure"

Sheriff "Change gears a little bit Frank, in past meeting following up on what Dr. Carrison mentioned. I certainly was a proponent of the population based funding formula based on the timelines and the realities of population distribution of the State. However, I have made mentioned and I know others have in the past about the need for the State to get a legitimate state wide threat assessment made, so we in the finance committee get some kind of guide or strategic plan as to what the real needs are and become less proprietary and we have something that has some legitimacy to it done with someone with some kind of expertise as to where the threats are and how these monies should be spent. I'd like a progress report on the States implementation or acquisition of a statewide threat assessment so we have something we can work with."

Mr. Siracusa "Sheriff, we at the State level have not provided and not done a comprehensive threat assessment. What I talked to Dr. Carrison about is that this body allocate a portion of the Homeland security dollars for that purpose. Those dollars would be used to contract, or however it is done, to bring in the experts to be able to do an objective, comprehensive assessment of the State. We do not have the homeland security dollars or the staffing to do it within our agency. Obviously we can use homeland security dollars or a portion of those dollars to allocate for that particular purpose."

Sheriff Young, "All I would say to that is that the state gets a 20% cut of that money and this is a statewide study that we need. The expectation for Clark County to fund that I think is a little unbalanced. I think we need to have a re-accounting of those State dollars and what they can be used for. My understanding of those is that they can be used for statewide application, I think may be missing that boat in hearing that those funds are not available."

Mr. Carrison "I want to say that it is interesting that I have not talked to Sheriff Young about this. This is will be a priority of the Commission. This is what has been lacking in this. There has been absolutely no statewide threat assessment. It has to be done as soon as possible. It is my understanding that it may impossible to do it before the 06 Grant Cycle. That is going to be in my opinion the number one priority. My role, as Chairman of this Commission, is to obtain a global threat assessment. I am not talking about each individual agency threat assessment, those are done frequently, the airport does it, and Metro is doing it. A lot of agencies do it. But we do not have a global state wide threat assessment and we are distributing money based on a formula not based on the fact of here the need is or the threat is. That will be a priority."

Mr. Siracusa "If I may answer and in response to you Sheriff Young, the Homeland Security dollars, both the State portion of the

grant dollars and the local government portion of the grant dollars are at the discretion of this body. It is up to this body to make a determination if they want to use a portion of the State's 20% to do a state wide needs assessment or cost share with the local government side. That is strictly the prerogative of this Committee on how you want to allocate these dollars. We will make sure that whatever the pleasure of this body is gets done."

Mr. Hadfield "I think we can deal with that under item 6 of this agenda. If we have unallocated money. Someone mentioned Churchill County as an example. How much time do we have to spend that money? The reason I am asking is that we are trying to come up with a pot of money from the next year funding cycle that we are not sure when it is going to start. We have, what I am going to call surplus money, unallocated money that the equipment was less expensive and is left over. This money can be used to start the process sooner, rather than waiting until we get all the money to allocate in the next cycle of funding "

Ms. Carmazzi "In response to your question, the numbers represented in these documents that show they are expired are up for reallocation. Just to let this Committee know, in the past up to federal fiscal year 02, what the previous Committee did was a prioritization process. Any funding that was up for reallocation would go on to those next identified priorities. That committee is no longer in place. We at DEM assumed to continue the same process as directed by the Commission previously. Obviously, that is at the discretion of this Committee and the Commission."

Mr. Hadfield "I know that is a specific item on the next agenda item. I would throw that out as a possibility to start the process sooner if in fact, people have received what they wanted and identified. There may be something next down the list that as we pointed out. The risk assessment is pretty critical. We understand what we are accomplishing, where the information we are getting to allocate the resource. Are there any other questions for Frank under agenda item 5?"

Mr. Siracusa "To continue on. The LETTP the Law Enforcement Prevention Program, this distribution was based on the population of the participating Counties only. Not all the counties participated in this particular program because it is restricted to law enforcement agencies. Those law enforcement agencies within those counties that did participate, the funding was based on population and there again 2% was retained for Tribal nations. Then a \$20,000 base with residual allocated based on percentage of each tribal application based on overall application requests. Going back to the tribal requests, because they are a sovereign nation, we do not have a whole of requirements on regulating the tribal nations. These are monies allocated through the State. Therefore this body can establish whatever regulations it needs fit to regulate those tribal nations and will be enforced. The Citizen Corps program, again this was based on population and it was only to those certified counties, which actually had viable citizen corps programs. At that time, the counties were Clark, Washoe and Mineral. These were the funding formulas for the 04 grant dollars. Any questions that I can answer?"

Mr. Hadfield "Sheriff any questions? Anything else? Seeing none, we will close agenda item 5 and move on to agenda item 6, unless people would like to take a five-minute break, or would you like to keep going. We will take a ten minute break."

Mr. Hadfield "I am going to call the finance committee back to order. I see Chuck is hanging in there. Frank did we conclude

everything you wanted to talk about under agenda item 5. Then we will close agenda item 5 and proceed to agenda item 6, Grants Management Policies/Procedures. Frank and Kamala are going to present this. This is useful information towards making a decision as to how we are going to, well what recommendations we are going to make to the full Commission regarding how we handle these items."

Mr. Siracusa "Mr. Chairman, I am going to defer this to Kamala Carmazzi."

Ms Carmazzi, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Starting with letter a under agenda item 6. What we wanted to discuss is the grant performance period. We need to talk about it two-fold. The State typically receives a two-year performance period on these grants. What we have recently found is that now ODP is willing to provide six-month extensions, a year with some reasonable battling. One of the things we need to concern ourselves with for the management of sub-grants is that we provide our sub-grants currently with a one-year performance period so that not only we but, this committee as well as the Commission, have adequate time to make determinations on potential funding re-distribution. What we are looking for here is more for a policy decision from this committee and, obviously with an approval of the Commission, on what you folks would like to see happen with the grant performance period relative to the sub-grants. One of the considerations is obviously as it was explained earlier, the subgrantees are running into problems out there as far as backlogs. With 50 states and territories going to the same vendors, the vendors are getting backlogged creating delays for our local governments and counties to receive the equipment and therefore getting the documentation to us. What is the preference of the committee and how firm do we stick to these performance periods? Right now, we are running into problems giving extensions all over the place. So that people can get these funds expended, obviously running us into the end of ours."

Mr. Hadfield "I am going to let the committee members ask questions and express their thoughts. Then I would like to take action on these item by item so we can move forward and not have a lot of discussion and have to go back."

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Kamala in terms of when the money is encumbered, when a purchase order is actually issued, does that satisfy the performance or do you have to have delivery. Particularly in the large equipment, it is getting to be an issue to get the stuff in, when is the performance satisfied?"

Ms. Carmazzi "I will do this again two-fold. From our stand point, if we issue a subgrantee a one-year performance period, as long as those funds are obligated or encumbered within the performance period, then it will be eligible under that performance period. It is basically the same way that the federal government treats us. What concerns us is that at the end of the sub-grant performance period, we allow the subgrantee 60 days to close the grant. Let's say your performance period ended September 30, technically you have until November 30 to close your grant with us. With us, and the federal Government, if our performance period ends March 31, we have until June 30 to close out that grant, but funds cannot be encumbered past March 31. The same concept applies for both the subgrantees and us. The performance period we provide you, up to that last day, you can encumber funds."

Mr \_\_\_\_\_ "When you say encumber, I'm hearing we have issued a purchase order. When you say close the grant. Does that mean we actually have delivery and have been invoiced for it? When we purchase

a vehicle worth several hundred thousand dollars, some of these things, have a lead tax are over a year by the time you issue the purchase order by the time it is queue manufactured and delivered. How does that work? Once you issue the purchase order the vendor is obligated to deliver does that satisfy the obligation for this performance period."

Ms. Carmazzi, "No, if it is not invoiced and we have not paid you for it, within the sixty-day closing period of your performance period, then we have a problem. That is what we are here to discuss today. This is why we provided the extensions almost up to the eleventh hour on our part with the local governments. Because, for example, we have given Clark County extensions until December 31 of this year. In some cases our grants officially close March 31. We have to give you 60 days to close out your process, leaving ourselves only a month to close out for us with the Feds. We do have an additional 90-day period for us to close out. My concern is that if we do not have you closed by that point and time we cannot close and if there is any residual funding left, obviously that is going to create another problem. At that point we are sending federal dollars back to the federal government."

Mr. Hadfield "Kimberly"

Ms McDonald, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ms. Carmazzi, how many extensions have been granted on an average for all the entities? I know there is quite a bit there, but how many would you guesstimate?"

Ms. Carmazzi "With the exception of some of our smaller counties, almost everybody. It is a widespread problem that we have. Like I said, there is a multitude of reasons."

Ms McDonald, "OK, and granting an extension of six months, does that have or does it appear to have the entities enough time to be in compliance? Is six months enough time."

Ms. Carmazzi "Because the problem, in the case of Clark County where we extended until December 31. They have until February to close out with us, our performance period would end March 31 or even April 30. We have inadequate time to reallocate federal funds. Now I will say at this particular time, for just information of this committee we are seeking extensions from the federal government and we will keep you informed of our progress. Whether or not we can obtain those, but right now it is of concern."

Ms McDonald, "Thank you."

Dr. Carrison "It seem it actually becomes impossible in some cases. It sounds like a bureaucratic thing from Washington. Clearly what Jim is alluding to in my mind I have submitted my purchase order. I have a contract that I am buying this item from and it takes a year and a half to do it. Technically I am outside the grant cycle. I purchased it. I have a contract with the vendor, now the federal government is saying you have not spent the money. In reality, I have spent the money, but I do not give them the money until they have delivered the product. So how has the federal government interacted with the State of Nevada as far as granting extensions on that money?"

Ms. Carmazzi "We are seeking for 03 phases one and two. We are seeking six-month extensions on those and push it to a year if we can. On the 04 money, we are going to automatically be granted an extension, because while we did not actually receive an award until April 10, they backdated the performance period to December of 03."

Dr. Carrison "That is a good reason to look at that. The part that concerns me is any time you have a situation like this, and I have seen it in the federal government. It becomes gamesmanship. Just getting something to throw the dollars at so you do not send the

dollars back because every time you send the dollars back you get less the next year. That is clearly what we are trying to prevent because we have needs that need to be fulfilled but cannot be fulfilled under the rules they are having us operate."

Mr. Hadfield "Glade"

Mr. Myler "Chairmen, Carrison and Hadfield. I just want you to know that attorney general Brian Sandoval is on the federal Department of Homeland Security advisory council and they have addressed these problems with funding. If you have any concerns with how the federal government is, DHS in particular, are allocating these funds or anything with that process. Please contact me and if you have some concerns let me know and I can give those to Brian Sandoval and he can take them back to that advisory council. We are lucky to have someone in the State to have someone who has daily contact with that council."

Mr. Hadfield "Glade I think the discussion that we just had there are circumstances where the system appears to be such that it cannot work due to, frankly the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been put out there to a limited number of vendors to produce equipment and they cannot get it done. I think that issue of the purchase order as a contract. Once that is done that should be recognized by the federal government as a contract for purchase. If it goes beyond the timeframe, I think that is a legitimate issue to raise. Giles, yes." TAG Vanderhoof "If I may, I get an awful lot of federal dollars for the National Guard, and once I obligated that money with public works, or I have issued a purchase order or contract for something, all of my money is considered obligated. Money that has that fiscal year period on it. That has to be expended that fiscal year, construction money can be 3-5 years, but the minute that I sign a contract or a purchase order and the time period stops, the federal government considers it spent. I am doing millions and millions of dollars that way. This is not something unique that we have been asking for. In addition with what the Attorney General can do I will work with Frank on this. I will be meeting with a lot of the Homeland Security people in the next month and I will bring that up too. To me that constitutes and expenditure of the funds. It is the way I have always operated in the National Guard and it is a legitimate in the federal government."

Mr. Hadfield "I think between you Mr. Chairman, and our legal counsel and Giles, you have understand the issue, you have an example perhaps a policy in writing that can be used as an example. Would that take care of the problem? If we can get that recognition from the federal government if we got everyone to use purchase orders?"

Ms. Carmazzi "I do not know what programs the General is working under. What we are required to do and what we agreed to, is that following a performance period without an extension, in essence, we have 90 days to close that grant. Any funds obligated up to that point we are OK. We still have that 90-day deadline to meet in the closure. Now if there was some way that we can get a waiver from that, as a result of a legitimate obligation of funds, during the performance period we will seek it out. I will do the homework with ODP on that."

Mr. Carrison "It was a two-part question to you Kamala, the concern is, what is the reality of this. We have one agency that is contracted for something. We have one agency that has contracted for something. We have given extensions based on the fact that somebody is contracted for something and they have not got it, or do you have a number of people who have simply not expended their money and they want an extension."

Ms. Carmazzi "Dr. Carrison, in response. I think we have a combination of both. I do have my files in front of me to tell you



specifically who. But can tell you honestly that a lot of our large ticket items we are facing exactly what Jim mentioned. For example, I know under the state side we had two mobile command posts that were approved for the highway patrol, and as Jim stated that is a very long process. Getting those in."

Mr. Carrison "My point is the Commission, if you simply are saving your money or have not figured what to spend it on. You do not need the grant extension; you do not need to spend it. If you have gone out and try to buy something and you could not get it made, that is fine. But if you have this money for something and you did not expend it than you do not need it. There are reasons for grant extensions there are reasons you do not need them. For us as the finance subcommittee we need to delineate between the two instead of trying to make a global rule for the two. There are reasons for the extension, there are extenuating reasons like the contract that has been issued and we do not have the equipment, but that is not a reason for the extension if you have the money and you simply have not spend it."

Mr. Hadfield "Chuck, I do not want to leave you out, do you have any comments?"

Mr. Lowden, " Did you see me leaning towards the mike to respond to a couple of those comments? I think we are maybe a bit over sideways. I absolutely agree that the federal government should change their guidelines and allow the local governments be they state, county or local governments to issue purchase orders and encumber the funds. Unfortunately, that is something I do not think we have any control over. Sitting here in this finance subcommittee. We can make recommendations, and I would hope the Attorney General as well as General Vanderhoof will take those comments and hopefully get something changed and get that taken care of at the federal level. With that said, I agree with Dr. Carrison, I do not know that we have anything in front of us to consider. I have not seen any recommendations come across my desk at least. But certainly if a local government or a grantee has moved ahead gotten approval for some kind of construction, or some kind of delivery of the product, whether that be a vehicle or a program and has signed or encumbered funds to get that down. I can support wholeheartedly. One of the things the City of Reno has done with the funds received last year, is our award of contract is based on successfully receiving the federal pass through and the vendor has in fact accepted that. We have no obligation, as a local government, to accept the unit if it is not delivered in time or not paid for through the grant process. So there are ways we can avoid the full contract consequences. Having something in place then, that will allow the division of emergency management as our agents to decide whether to grant an extension or not is incumbent upon us. Unfortunately, without having specific language that we can deal that with today, we may be a year away from getting that done. I think that is just a fact of life. I am supportive of getting something together. I certainly do not have a plan in place. In general we can talk about concepts. With concepts and no specifics we are going to have basically the same process we have today.

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you Chuck. If I might, I think we can do something. What you are doing is you are giving a year, and then an extension. There must be a reasonable amount of time, less than a year, by which we can say, when the money is awarded, within the next period of time, you need to have gone out to bid. You need to do something. But clearly by now people know what they need to buy. They have been crating a list for sometime. They are going down the list,

it is not like they are going to rush out and say OK, now what are we going to buy. I think most entities have an understanding of what they need and what they are going to be asking for when they go to the LEPC. Is there not something that we can say, if we do not receive documentation, that you have taken a specific act to encumber the money, you have gone out to bid, something within 90 days of the grant award. Something that you are going to have to come back and explain why we should continue down that path. Is that being unreasonable to do that? It is not like we are starting all over again and no one has any idea of what is going on here. I am looking at the government entities, the Sheriff and Kimberly to see if there is something we can do to give them guidance. Now, they can always come back to the finance subcommittee. Of course we may recommendations to the Commission. The Commission takes the final action. If we set the Commission meeting 90 days after, for example, after awarding the grants, we have quarterly Commission meeting. Everybody is going to know we will be in session and if there is some special appeal it can be brought before the full Commission but at least they are put on notice. We are serious about this. When you get the award you should be ready to go, except if you have to go to bid. You already know what the specs are, the manufacturer has given you the specs. We are talking about sole providers in many cases. It is not like we are starting from scratch. This is just an idea I throw that out to, and Sheriff, and Kimberly and Chuck to you too to respond to."

Mr. Lowden, "While I appreciate the suggestion on time, realistically, I think you are looking more like a nine month period of time if you are talking about every local government actually take some action as far as getting a reasonable quote, going out to bid, actually getting something past the local legislative body. Literally, the local elected officials need to take some action to accept these grants and to award the expenditure of these grants through a contract process and I think again, we have a two year window for expenditure and if you limit this basically a sign off or a commitment to a nine month period of time, then you have additional time to reaward the grants if the local or the grantee is not up to moving ahead with the process. I would recommend nine months.

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you"

Mr. Spinello, " Carolyn, Tim Mike, Pat, as the proposals, the grant requests come up. Are they not based on manufacturers' specifications on an actual product? I share the concerns that we have timelines, to set up these things, you have open meeting law issues. It is not the least cumbersome process that we have to get these things done. Certainly want to make sure we do not trap any of the entities. Any of you want to comment."

Mr. Hadfield "Please come forward and state your name for the record."

Mike Cyphers, " Mike Cyphers emergency management coordinator with the City of Henderson. In response to Mr. Spinello's question, I think that the recommendations given by Mr. Lowden up North are certainly doable, and if that after nine months after the grant award. The answer to your questions is yes. We put in for these grants we have a real good idea because we have to have some sort of bid or quote some idea of the expenditure we are looking at before we even ask for the funds. So nine months after we get that grant award should be plenty of time to get through the local council. Get your approval and start your purchasing process. And that is assuming you can do some of the sole source items. Every now and then you still get stuck with

something where you have to go out for three bids or go through that process. So nine months is certainly doable."

Mr. Hadfield "Thank you, Chuck I do not want to eliminate something if there is some in the audience up there that has a strong feeling, or they can provide us with some professional opinion, I welcome them."

Mr. Lowden, "They all have strong opinions but nobody is moving forward."

Mr. Hadfield "Back to the Committee, what about nine months, I mean it is better than a year. Well Kim, go ahead then Kamala has something to say."

Ms McDonald, "Thank you Mr. Chairman, just wandering if Pat Lofft from City of North Las Vegas, can come forward and tell us about our particular process before responding some more."

Ms. Lofft "Similar to what Mike Cyphers said. We can deal with it."

Glade Myler "I offer that whatever you want to do, to use the leverage of the Attorney General to set up a meeting with Frank and Kamala to talk to him and put our concerns, I'll be glad to put that together."

Mr. Hadfield "I think we definitely want that. Now, Kamala, what is your thought?"

Ms. Carmazzi "Mr. Chairman, a couple of things. While I realize as Chuck Lowden pointed out it is very difficult to put policy down with nothing in front of you. I guess perhaps it is something we can hammer out probably better and more appropriately in the following grant cycle. As a suggestion for the interim, I am in agreement, if the funds are not encumbered, or obligated at the subgrantee level by the end of the performance period, something is wrong. What I would like to offer is that any funds that remain unobligated at that point, if we could make it perhaps a policy or a procedure that those funds are, in essence, relinquished."

Mr. Hadfield "For clarification that would be at the end of the twelve months?"

Ms Carmazzi "At the end of the sub-grantee's performance period. Then this committee can reallocate those funds."

Mr. Hadfield "How would this committee feel about that. That seems more than fair."

Mr. Lowden, "So moved."

Mr. Hadfield "Chuck Lowden, so moved. I have a motion to adopt that as a policy which would be that if the entities do not formally allocate, in the formal manner, the funds within the formal period following notification of grant award, that the monies would revert back to the Commission for reallocation, is that the motion?"

Dr. Carrison "Just to clarify by obligated we mean issued a purchase contract, a purchase order."

Ms. Carmazzi "Correct, and that means actions taken to actually make the purchase, as Dr. Carrison expressed before, we have occasion with some of these grants where we have reached the end of the performance period and absolutely nothing has been spent on certain things. That has happened, and we've got two occasions of that ."

Mr. Hadfield "Does everybody understand the motion? Do I have a second before I opened it up for discussion?"

Dr. Carrison "Second."

Mr. Hadfield " OK, I have a motion and a second. I noticed that someone in the audience that wants to make a comment, if you could come forward and identify yourself please."

Mr. McAndrew "Tim McAndrew, emergency manager, City of Las Vegas. It sounds as though possibly this is going to be an automated process, so I just want to clarify that if there is an extension request, that would still be considered before just an automated reversal, or withdrawal of funds that have not been encumbered."

Mr. Hadfield "My understanding of the motion, and correct me if I am wrong would be, that an extension request would have to be approved by the commission since we are saying that if you have not done anything up to that point, it is going to be reverted to the Commission and if there is some appeal, because I suppose we always have to have an appeal process, that would be made at the same time. That is my interpretation of how this policy would work if implemented. Am I missing something? Glade says yes. Does that satisfy your concern?"

Mr. Myler "I agree you would need an appeal process."

Mr. Hadfield "Any comments on the motion, any further public comment excuse me Chuc."

Mr. Lowden, "One more from the North if I could Mr. Chairman, hearing that questions of appeal, I am not sure what the finance subcommittee feels but being an open meeting, we may want to take or maybe willing to take some of the load of the full Commission and if acceptable, perhaps this board could be the hearing board for appeals. The final recommendation would go to the Commission. But we would be the ones to make that decision."

Dr. Carrsion, "As Chairman, I would be very satisfied with that. I think the Commission as a whole has the final say but certainly the appeals can be heard by the finance subcommittee and recommendations then made to the Commission with regards to those appeals."

Mr. Hadfield "Is that acceptable to the maker of the motion and the second to clarify the motion to include that?"

Mr. Lowden, "As maker of the motion, that is correct, Chuck Lowden."

Mr. Hadfield "I forgot who seconded it"

Subcommittee "Dr. Carrison"

Mr. Hadfield "OK, we have a motion on the floor, any further discussion? All those in favor note by saying Ay, Opposed by saying Nay, motion carries unanimously."

Mr. Carrison "Mr. Chairman, as a second part of that with regard to the funding distribution. Now, we have a priority, the Commission has a priority with regard to threat assessment for the State of Nevada. We have a need for funds for that threat assessment. We need to establish a process hereby we decide how we are going to do that. Recommendations for funding should come from this subcommittee for the general evaluation of the Commission as a whole. It would be my hopes that this committee would recommend that the unallocated funds be used to start the process whereby we are going to have this threat assessment done. This is something, as Sheriff Young pointed out. Yes, maybe we do not get it done until the grant cycle of 06, but this is extremely important to the State of Nevada to know that we are allocating our resources where they are going to the most good, for the benefit for most people and for the protection of citizens of Nevada. It is extremely important that we start this threat assessment process. If we have reallocated, if we have funds that are left over from this, that we have not been used, then it could be the reallocation of those funds to start the threat assessment process now."

Sheriff Young, "I couldn't agree with you more, Dr. Carrison, However, for the purposes of this body we need to make that recommendation. I believe that is something that we will have to take to the whole Homeland Security Commission. As you recall, we agreed

that the unused funds would go on to the next item on the list. I think from a policy standpoint we better move on this. If we don't, it's just going to get done.

Mr. Hadfield, "Glade, from the agenda say there is another item on that?

Mr. Myler, "From a legal aspect there is an expectation in those entities that have prioritized what they were going to spend the money on...there is an expectation on their part that with the unallocated funds those priorities that didn't get funded would get funded. So, legally you may have a problem there, but if the whole commission addresses it, it would be given that responsibility, then it is defensible. I am not saying we wouldn't get some challenges to it, but it is defensible.

Mr. Hadfield, "Looking at the agenda we have the sub-grantees projects, change request and distribution method for performance, and residual funding all three of those potentially come into play. Kamala, you were waving you hand.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman in response to you, Dr. Carrison and Sheriff Young. One of the things that going to happen to Item # 7 in a little bit here. There is something this body and the full commission should be aware of. Obviously, it is not anything set in stone yet, but it is currently a consideration at the congressional level. Sheriff Young and Dr. Carrison are right on track, One of the things they are looking at doing is, possibly beginning in 05, and a stronger likelihood in 06, is that they would be giving the states a .55% base allocation. The Remaining portion of the Homeland Security money at the federal level would then be distributed on a competitive basis nationwide based on risk, threat, and vulnerability. Now, with that said, we just currently underwent a review, if you will, by the Inspector General's Office, Office of Domestic Preparedness [ODP] , Department of Homeland Security. They are extremely critical of their own process in the State's Needs Assessment they we currently have to complete. One of the things that is of sincere concern to us at this particular point, is that if they use those as a basis, we're in trouble. Let me just explain a little bit. Using a scale of 1 to 5 to rank, rate if you will, the risks, threats and vulnerabilities in each jurisdiction, there's no standardization for the application of those numbers throughout our state. And as you can well imagine throughout our nation. So if those are the numbers they are going to be using... And I can give you an example... Something that might be considered a level five, just an absolute catastrophe for our folks in Lincoln County may only classify as a two here in Clark County. And that is what I am saying. What does a two mean? What does a five mean? There is no standardization to the process. But, what that could mean for us in the end is that is if we are held the current risk, threat and vulnerability assessments that were done through the ODP process, and if that is what they are going to base the distribution on throughout the state, then it is not standard in our state, it would not be standard across that nation. And it isn't going to take too many of these states to terribly long to figure out, 'we better all be fives'. That's just a little side information for everybody to consider."

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. What I hear you saying is, we need to get going, and get it done. We'll move down to sub-grantee project savings. By the way I am looking at the clock and I realize that some of you had an expectation to be out of here earlier. We will move along as fast as we can, but I don't want to cut off any discussion."

Ms Carmazzi, "Sub-grantee project savings, the only thing we are looking for there, is just there wasn't any clear cut process outlined

for us. What we would like to do is explain our expectation and make sure that is what we came out of the last Finance Committee with. It is our understanding that the remaining funds left over by a jurisdiction, if they manage to save money on a project, if they had any unfunded projects in their application, then they could apply those same funds to following unfunded projects within their applications. That is what we are looking for.

Sheriff Young, "Mr. Chairman, if I could? That was our understanding when we did that. As you know, you're kinda making your best guess when you are doing some of these things. Sometimes you run over a few bucks in one area and save a little money, and sometime certain things go a little over. We need a little flexibility to do that, so if we save a little money I would certainly hope that that jurisdiction would be able to expend it on their next priority or on something else that is already in their plan. I believe that is the direction we were trying to make six months ago.

Dr. Carrison, "Do we need a motion on that? Or is that already occurring?

Ms Carmazzi, "That is our assumption, yes, we are doing that. We just want to make sure that is the wishes of this body.

Mr. Myler, "No you would not have a motion if that has already passed. I was not at that meeting, but I gathered from the Minutes that's what happened.

Mr. Hadfield, [to Ms Carmazzi], "OK, stay the course.

Ms Carmazzi, "Item c project change request. That is going to lead us right into this one. We have had occasion, fortunately not too many times, and we would like to preface the with the fact that we don't want jurisdictions to stop doing good business here, if they realize that they ordered item A, say PPE, and then realize that item B is more appropriate. We don't want to stop that process. What I need the committee's decision on is if I have a jurisdiction that makes a project change request for something totally unrelated. It's not in the application.

Mr. Hadfield, "I'll just start out, if I might. I don't think that is acceptable. Again, if we were starting out from scratch now, but people have been in this process, they have a pretty good idea, and I think that all the work has gone into preparing the application. What you are saying is that some might just say, 'Well, forget about that we decided we want something else, now.' Personally, I think it is too late in the game to change. Now there may be people here with more experience...

Sheriff Young, "Mr. Chairman, I agree and I disagree. And I'll give you an example of something Metro. We got in the 04 money, quite a bit a bit of money expended for a radio project that is very, very complicated and as we progressed through this we're finding that there is a lot issues. There may be a time when we need to make a change because the piece that we got allocated for is a small piece that of probably a \$40 million budget we couldn't fund without these Homeland Security dollars. And what we are finding is that the competitiveness within the radio world they are not making our job easier. I'm not saying we are going to make a major change, but there may be a time where we need a little bit of flexibility on some of these complicated long-term projects. It's not always as cut and dried as some might feel.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, I guess more specifically what I am referring to, and Sheriff in response. If you have different components as long as it is in the same line like communications we

aren't questioning that. What I am saying is if you requested 10 SCBA's...

Sheriff Young, "I am not suggesting that we are going from buying radio for something totally unrelated. I am talking within the same discipline. We may have some changes that we need to make.

Ms Carmazzi, "Right. What we are questioning is when we have a complete change of intent.

Sheriff Young, "I got ya.

Dr. Carrison, "That is completely unacceptable. If you have a complete change, it's like, 'Ah, we don't do this and we have this money, so let's buy this.' No. You have the grant cycle, you figured out your priorities. What Sheriff Young is talking about is totally different. That's within the same part and you need that flexibility to make those changes.

Mr. Siracusa, "We're taking a look at so many applications with so many change requests, almost on a daily basis, it becomes a tremendous workload. Obviously, if it is within scope, that's a given. We have several that are completely apples and oranges. And that is what we are talking about.

Mr. Hadfield, "Glade I assume you are telling us to make a recommendation to the Commission to change the policy?

Mr. Myler, "Legally, the question is who is to make the decision whether this change of intent is correct or not. Do you want to leave the responsibility to DEM or do you want that here in the Finance Committee?

Mr. Hadfield, " We can throw that open for ... but if we say that if it is outside of, what was the language?

Ms Carmazzi, "Intent?"

Mr. Hadfield, "If it is out of the intent, and you have certain categories, because we don't want to eliminate the flexibility the Sheriff was talking about. It's pretty clear, right? I mean this isn't a difficult decision. Somebody takes a major shift, I think we can delegate it to staff. Knowing that I would defer to the Chairman of the Commission.

Dr. Carrison, "The Commission's there, and if they don't like what Mr. Siracusa and Ms Carmazzi are doing they can certainly come and make comments. I don't want to take 50 things and take up the Commission's time with apples and oranges. We set a general policy that if it's apples and oranges it's the discretion of the evidence the will of this Finance Committee and it's the will of, if I speak on behalf of the Commission, I don't want to see that happen. I want you to do it and just deny it [talking to Ms Carmazzi and Mr. Siracusa]. Now if somebody wants to come and talk to us when you do that, that's fine.

Mr. Siracusa, "Mr. Chairman, if I may add. We would very rarely completely discount a request. We will certainly go back to the politically subdivision, the county or local government, and have a discussion as to what it is, so we are not just arbitrarily looking to say, 'Hey, its going to go away.' We really sit down with them and make sure that it is totally out and then at that point it is excluded.

Mr Spinello, "Just a comment, and let me know Frank and Kamala if this would be a burden to you. What if we added something additional, and that is, something of a process or maybe a report, that you bring to the Commission on some of the requests and your disposition, or decision, on them. That would be something we could take note of, unless there was some reason not to. Because the other thing, too, I want to protect you from. Because, as our staff, quite frankly, from having some of the entities try to work you over a little bit over something. I'm staff when I go back to my office and I know what that

can be like, and it also give you the support that you need from the Commission. That would be part of what we see on a meeting basis.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chariman, ah Jim, what you are looking for is just a report of who the jurisdiction is, what the request is whether we approved or denied it?

Mr. Hadfield, "Correct. I think that is part of the accountability that we talked about earlier. Kimberly.

Ms McDonald, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just want to echo some of the comments that have been stated earlier. I do feel that Frank and Kamala should have that discretion. They are working with it and they need to keep the process expedited and not to become backlogged. If a change order, what's it called, a project change request is totally unrelated, then, yes, it should be brought to our attention. Other than that, I think accountability is a very big, critical issue, and I heard the vision of our new Chairman as well, and some of our new Committee members. We are going to have to be much more accountable. Local governments have already done the research ahead of time for what they will be requesting, so I think that they should definatley stick to that commitment. Thank you.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Chuc, any further comments up north?

Mr. Lowden, "No.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do we need a motion on this, since we're changing policy? Yes, we need a motion to recommend to the Commission that we change... Any comments from the audience on this?

Mr. McAndrew, "Tim McAndrew, again, Las Vegas Emergency Management. I am trying to track this conversation. This has been going as well, and just to clarify. I think what you ferreted out is that those changes that are within the same discipline, that are within the intent is the adjective that has been used here, is essentially appropriate. Using the example that the Sheriff used under a communication project, if it is comples and you are working with a vendor need to do something a little differently. That of course is something that is appropriate. Having said that, am I understand that is no longer considered a project change request, and so hence, your yield out of this thing, and I think it is a good thing, is that the true project change, which right now are quite many, will now be shrunk down to a short few, and that is if they are actually changing the intent.

Mr. Hadfield, "No, that is not the intent. We still have to be accountable to the Federal government. We are eliminating those changes that totally "change" the intent of the original application submitted to the Commission for funding. They don't want radios anymore, they want to buy patrol cars. We're not going to take it.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, just to echo what you said and in response to what Mr. McAndrew said. One of the things, obviously, that we also have to have the project change request for is because we are literally in a position having to report line item by line item, every piece of equipment purchased by everybody. So we have to have that detail. I apologize for that, I realize it's cumbersome, but we've got to have that level of detail to report back to the Federal government.

Mr. McAndrew, "I just want to make sure, because I suspect that there was perhaps there was some perception that things were going to speed up by your actions here. If it is still the requirement to submit project change requests for each and every widget, and I'm talking quantities of widgets, your into delay issues is why I'm gonna tell you. I mean somebody has to fill out that project change request. It gets submitted to somebody, who submits it to somebody else, typically, and there is a period of time in there. It sounds as though your board



is the one that will be....I'm sorry, staff is going to be the one that actually reviews it and provides....in a nut shell what I am trying to tell you is that you are dealing with time lost issues where your project eventually comes to a standstill because you really can't move forward, often times, until you know that project change request is approve. I just wanted to make sure that was understood.

Mr. Hadfield, "Correct. I think Kimberly [Ms McDonald] stated it very well. We are asking for accountability in the process and we want people, when they put in a grant application, to do as much homework as they can ahead of time, which should eliminate some of the need for change orders. Maybe things are available in a better price or quantity, but we're hoping that through accountability, making it clear that we are going to hold people accountable for this process that some of this stuff is going to go away anyway. That's not being critical of anybody, it's just that we haven't told them our expectation. We plan on letting everybody know what our expectation is and holding them to it. That is my kind of summary of what we are doing here.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, in the interest of expediency, which Tim does bring up legitimately as a concern, maybe one of the things DEM can offer on the change requests that do not involve any change of intent, maybe we can offer a verbal approval followed up in writing. If that would be of benefit.

Mr. Hadfield, "That is something you can do internally without permission from us. I think that anything that can expedite the process, we would agree with. Looks like we have another comment from the audience. Please come forward and identify yourself for the record.

Ms Carolyn Levering, "Good morning, I'm Carolyn Levering, the Planning and Operations Coordinator for Clark County Emergency Management. I'm also the grants sub-committee chairman our LEPC. I just want to respectfully request that as this group comes together with policy recommendations for consideration of the Commission that it also include standard operating procedures. A lot of these policies, once they are made with the best intentions, have an opportunity for re-interpretation down the line, which frustrates us on a local level when we try to use those policies and work within them, when we don't have procedures set to know how to work within those policies. It makes it a little bit difficult. We've had discussion about appeals processes, requests processes and we need to have those processes developed and communicated down to the local level.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you, I appreciate your comment. I am sure that is the intent of the committee to work with Giles and make sure that when we do something to make sure we have clear communication. We are trying to do this through the application process, by the way, so that when the next application process goes out everything will be clear, and if it isn't we need to know so we can make sure it is. We will do diligence because that is a legitimate concern. Thank you.

Mr. Myler, "If I could recommend staff for Homeland Security Commission should probably could put together a book of standard operating procedures and policies. Obviously, give them more to do. Hopefully, we will have more staff...

Mr. Hadfield, "I'm just wondering if Dr. Carrison has some spare time?

Mr. Myler, "the only reason I am making that recommendation is that, more for my own benefit than anybody's, because if I have to defend us, it would nicer to have in a book and have there what was approved by this committee and commission.

Dr. Carrison, "At this time General Vanderhoof has the staff. Since he is the director, perhaps that should come from his staff.

Ms Carmazzi, "We would ask as the SAA [State Administrative Agent] to be involved in that process, obviously from the money management side.

Mr. Hadfield, "Clearly, you would work closely with our new administrator. Thank you. I still need a motion. Can I have a motion on this? To approve the changes we're recommending?

Ms McDonald, "Yes, I will take this. I so move that regarding the project change requests, that we empower the staff of the Division of Emergency Management to have the authority to determine extensions, and that for project changes that are markedly different that those be forwarded to the committee. ...

Mr. Hadfield, "Clarification? You said forward to the committee. I heard two things. One I heard was that we give them the authority to do it and then I thought I heard Jims say we'll receive a report knowing what they have done rather than to bring it back to us to act on. What is your intent?

Ms McDonald, "I guess that is the desire of the committee, then to receive the report instead of the committee to make that for the determination. OK. To simply receive the on extensions and project changes that were granted, a report from DEM, approval or denial and also to work with the LEPC and SAA to develop SOPs for implementation.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do I have a second?

Mr. Lowden, "Second.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do we have any further discussion? [none was heard] All those in favor signify by saying 'Aye.'

Mr. Myler, "One other comment, I think it should be made inherent with motion that any denials will be appealable to this body.

Mr. Hadfield, "I took a vote and that motion passed, so I am going to take another vote to provide for the appeals process. I would like a motion to say that appeals to the decision for project change orders will be directly appealable to the Finance Committee, with a recommendation to the Commission. That is the motion I am looking for.

Dr. Carrison, "I second that.

Mr. Hadfield, "I will let you make the motion. As the chair I'm not going to make the motion.

Dr. Carrison, "I so move.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do I have a second?

Mr. Spinello, "Second.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do we have any discussion? [none was heard] All those in favor signify by saying 'Aye'. ....Opposed? [motion carried unanimously] Thank you. Now we are getting there. Now we come to 'd' residual funds.'

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, this is a, ah....I think we will take this in two parts as well. First we've got, obviously from previous discussion, a consideration on the previous year's monies that are up for re-allocation. I don't know what the pleasure of this committee is. At this time we will have to wait for the final figures for the 03 Phase I and II. Relative to 04, because we have allowed these extensions, I don't know what the end result of that is going to be, but in essence should we get there how is funding to be distributed. What would be the pleasure of this committee and the process to do that?

Mr. Hadfield, "If I might, we've heard two things today. One, a strong desire by the committee to get that threat assessment going and not have to wait until the next round of funding to get that process, and I identified the possibility of residual funding being a source to

begin that process. On the other hand I know the Sheriff certainly elaborated, as did legal council, that there may be some expectations out there based on our previous actions. I just want to point that out to make sure that I certainly, as an individual members of this committee, I feel strongly that we should use that money and start that assessment process ASAP, so that by the time the next round of funding comes around we are not waiting, the assessment is done, and we have the assessment to help the commission use it as a tool. So I do favor that, however I do recognize the concerns that may exist, and the commission may have to hear this and maybe other discussion.

Dr. Carrison, "I would like to hear from Sheriff Young and others who may have residuals, to see how they feel about that.

Sheriff Young, "I just brought it up as a matter of fact, if that is what this commission would like to do with those funds. I agree with you guys. I think as we see where our real challenges are and we get a little bit more educated, I've been more organized on this board, I as a commission member, have no problem going back before that board with a proposal or recommendation from this committee that we change gears with those residual funds. We have several lines. I think Tim did a very good job of prioritizing what people's requests were, and we had a red line there where the majority of people top line stuff was approved and funded. So we are not talking about real critical stuff if we elected to take those funds. People would be going down into their second and third tier, in some cases, requests. I fell so strongly that this threat assessment for the entire state be done that I would be willing to make a recommendation, or make a motion, that we change gears and ask the full commission how we reallocate those funds. Take the residual funds and apply them to a threat assessment. Maybe taking 03 and potentially what we have in 04, we are certainly a long way from knowing what we have in 04, pooling those monies into a special fund getting started in the process of identifying whose available and what method we use to identify someone to do this statewide threat assessment.

Mr. Hadfield, "Sheriff, with your permission, I'll accept that as a motion, and we will have discussion.

Dr. Carrison, "I will second the motion.

Mr. Hadfield, "OK, under discussion.

Mr Lowden, "From the north. Absolutely support getting a statewide threat assessment done. Absolutely support funding that statewide threat assessment. But if I heard staff correctly from DEM, we have a very limited time to expend these leftover funds within that first two-year window. The funds under current guidelines, can't be committed, they have to be expended. It is a reimbursement process, so whatever it takes for this committee to make a recommendation to commission to use available funds as they come available and prioritize that statewide threat assessment, I would support wholeheartedly. I just don't see us being able to go out and spend the hundred, two hundred, or three hundred thousand dollars that we are going to have to get this done out of this years initial leftovers.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you, Chuc, for that point. Kamala.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, in response to Chuc, I believe you've got Elaine Fisher sitting in your audience, don't you Chuc?

Mr. Lowden, "I absolute do and I'm proud of it.

Ms Carmazzi, "Can she confirm that we are indeed are in communication with ODP on an extension on the ODP 03 Phases I & II funding?

Mr. Lowden, "Heard head is, I think moving, but she can come up to the microphone. Sure, come on up. I think, as a part of that is that a request does not necessarily mean it is going to go through?"

Ms Carmazzi, "That is correct. We have a strong likelihood on the "six month" and as it stands right now, as Elaine is coming up, as it stands right now, from a preliminary standpoint, and looking at these reports, that is obviously without consideration of the extensions that we have provided out there what residual funds we will get back that way. Right now we are sitting with about \$36,000 under 03 Phase I and about \$97,000 under Phase II. It is certainly, probably an adequate amount to get this project started. And if we can get a six-month possibly a one year extension on the monies, this should take us through approximately Mar of 06.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you for that clarification.

Ms Fisher, "the 03 Phase I and II, I am asking for a minimum of six months and maybe a year's extension. The 02 Grant closes December, so we will probably not have time at all to get an extension on that. We are working on that. Heber Willis [DHS ODP Funds Manager] was here a couple of weeks ago and he said that as long as it is worded correctly we should be able to get a six month to a year's extension on Phase I & II. So that is the one I am looking at right now: 03. 02, no.

Ms Carmazzi, "Elaine, in your conversation with Heber, did he indicate one way or the other whether or not we would get the one-year?"

Ms Fisher, "He said to ask for a year. And he said that possibly he would be able to give us a year, but we have never asked for a year, we have only ever asked for six-month extensions. So, I am hoping we get this one-year extension for Phase I and II. We should have no problem.

Mr. Hadfield, "Elaine, would you state your name for the record, so we have it on the tape?"

Ms Fisher, "Elaine Fisher.

Mr Hadfield, "thank you. Any questions of Elaine? [pause] Tank you, Elaine.

Mr Myler. "No questions for Elaine, but I would just like to to say that based on the discussion that has been made here, and particularly the comments from Sheriff Young, legally this would be defensible, very defensible in court, and I don't see any judge, in case one of the other entities were to sue the Homeland Security Commission or this committee... I don't see a judge saying that this was improper. So, I think we are OK legally.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Are there any other comments from the committee members on the motion? Any comment from the audience? Seeing none, I will call for a vote on the motion. All those in favor vote by saying 'Aye.' Opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries unanimously. Thank you, Frank? I'm looking at the clock and I know item # seven, we have a hand out, I believe. Can we handle that relatively quickly? Glade, can we do eight before seven, just in the interest of making sure that there may be people who maybe anticipated that we would be through right at noon, and I know that we need to make the decision about the 05 funding cycle.

Mr. Myler, "Yes, because the way the agenda indicates you may take items out of order, you're OK.

Mr. Siracusa, "Mr. Chairman, on item number seven, I touched this earlier. This was just an informational...I mean we really don't know where we are going to see our funding levels, so I think we can certainly skip this one.

Mr. Hadfield, "We can read it and if we have questions can we call? I believe we provided copies of this to the audience?"

Mr. Siracusa, "Sure.

Ms Carmazzi, "I would just like to add a clarification to the attachment that was provided to the committee. It is nothing more than a comparison done by the National Emergency Management Association. It is basically a comparative look, and some data has changed since the published date. Like Frank said, it is strictly informational. Just to give you an idea of what is going on.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. That concludes item number seven unless somebody has a question.

**Agenda Item # 8: FFY 05 ODP GRANT FUNDING CYCLE (Discussion/Action)**

Mr. Hadfield, "item 8, which is the FY 05 ODP grant funding cycle and its its funding distribution, jurisdiction reporting requirements, and federal reporting requirements.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly approaching the 05 funding cycle and are seeking some form of direction from the committee and commission, what is going to be the preferred funding method for the 05 funding cycle. We would like to open that up for discussion.

Dr. Carrison, "Kamala, and I understand it, we don't even know what 05 monies we are going to get?

Ms Carmazzi, "That is absolutely correct.

Dr. Carrison, "Part of this distribution is going to depend on whether we get this threat assessment done or not. Frank, you mentioned earlier that we, may not know anything until November about the 05 monies? Or when, next year?

Mr. Siracusa, "No, I would think that probably sometime in late October or November we should have some idea of our distribution. And we have no idea when...

Dr. Carrison, "One of the problems with our funding formula, unless we go back to where we were a year ago, we have no update, we have not improved the system, we haven't done anything, so I would like to hear from the other members what - how they want to address this. How you think it should be addressed.

Sheriff Young, "Mr. Chairman, this is probably going to be our biggest bone of contention the last couple of years. Frank is absolutely correct, I'm involved in a couple of groups that are doing lobbying efforts to congress right now and it is hard to say exactly what is going to come out. I know there is a strong, strong move, particularly from the east coast by some of the larger cities, to ensure that this thing moves more towards the Urban Area Security Initiative or that the major metropolitan areas get the bulk of the monies, and I suspect that's what is going to end up happening. I know the State of Wyoming got alot of money and there is not threat there. Reality is there is no Homeland Security threat there, certainly not to the extent...certainly what we feel in heightened level, as I think this state has had... We've had three major changes in the alert level here in Nevada, from yellow to orange, and I anticipate we are going to have another one here relatively soon. I guarantee you that that threat is going to be down here in southern Nevada. The intelligence information that I am getting, the information that is coming from various sources to prepare us is going to be in the urban area. And I just suspect that is where the funding is going to go. Now, with all that said, everybody in the state has constituents and feels strongly that their needs are, and no one citizen is any more important than another. In absence of that, to me it defies logic at this point and time and considering what we are facing, we all know we need to get the threat assessment, my recommendation would be to continue with the population based funding formula. Unless, something comes out in the

course of our commission meetings, that would supersede that, or show an immediate need or threat. Certainly, something could happen to some major critical infrastructure component somewhere in the state, whether it be a power station, a dam, a railroad line or something that could be anywhere. In absence of that, I recommend that this board continue on with the population based funding as a general rule.

Mr. Hadfield, "Can I ask for clarification? This current round we added the \$25,000 per entity. Is it your recommendation to continue that also?

Sheriff Young, "Either that or some similar amount. That way, everybody has a little bit to work with.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Other commission members? Kimberly.

Ms McDonald, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I agree with Sheriff Young about the population-based formula. I think it is the most equitable and most balance, but I would also like to open the discussion about the criteria. We keep pointing back to the criteria for even distributing the funding. I don't know where we start with that, but I think at our next meeting we need to have some hard fast language to help you all do your job better. So maybe you can tell us what direction, what difficulties are you dealing with right now that we can ponder and explore. So that we can expedite that.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Dr. Carrison.

Dr. Carrison, "I just wanted to say one other thing that I mentioned earlier, key to this grant distribution is. 'what did you do with your money last year?' I think that has to be part of our funding formula. Because if you, one, did clearly spend your money, or two, or you did something that the commission, or the population of Nevada might say, 'Boy, that is silly, that has nothing to do with Homeland Security or defense.' I think we need to recognize that, and if you can't come before this body and tell us what you got and how it benefited those people, then you shouldn't be applying for a grant for the 05 monies. That sounds cold, but this is all about distribution of resources for the benefit of the people of Nevada and if you put an alarm system on your car, I'm not sure how that helped anybody, but you spent our money doing that. That needs to be part of the process before you are allocated more money.

Mr. Hadfield, "Chuc? Do you have any comments?

Mr Lowden, "Yes, a couple, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Not to be too literal, but I don't want every county, and every city coming to this commission telling us what they did with their money. So, I would hope that Dr. Carrison would consider a report coming back illustrating what is going on. The other is that I would have some very strong support for continuing to sue the LEPC's as a screening group throughout the state to basically look at the grant requests, much as they have in the past. If there are additional guidelines, we could develop, Kimberly, I'm certainly in support of those. If there are additional guidelines we could give to the LEPC's to use as some of their guiding light that would be very helpful as well. We really have used, at least in the northern part of the state, the LEPC's to coordinate and not duplicate the request that we have and hopefully have applied the monies directly. I would hope that, Bill, that you are right and the only threat is in the southern part of the state and in Las Vegas. Unfortunately, we see to get some threats up here as well, and I am sorry you are not aware of those. As long as we are together using a population-base, then I am very supportive with continuing with the LEPC program. That is about it.

Mr. Hadfield, "If I might, take some liberty as Chairman? It appears to me there is consensus on the committee to continue the same,

and we'll take motions, the same funding formula, for the upcoming application period only. I would add to that, however, I think we should take, and we don't know the dollar amount, because we don't know the amount of residual money that will come forth. I think we should take off of the top of that, off of the grant monies available, money to be used to make sure that the threat assessment is in fact completed to the satisfaction of the commission, and I think that should come from everybody. I think it should come from the tribes, the locals, and from the state. I don't expect that to be a huge amount of money. Admititdly I don't know what that is, but I think we need to do that. Also, the comment about the LEPC, I am a strong supporter of the LEPC process. That's local governments within counties getting together to decide the priorities for their communities. I think we need to, and this is not a criticism of the LEPC's, but when we were talking about accountability, talking about reports, I want to follow on Dr. Carrison, I think we should ask each county, and that information could come from the LEPC's or from the county, I am not quire sure the appropriate body, maybe the LEPC's, to in fact prepare a report to answer the questions. You know, how is the funding received increased the security and response capability of your community. When I talk about disaster, I am not talking about terrorist event specifically, because I don't' think we can separate, as it is all one response system. It can be any disaster, my hope is that the equipment that is being purchased under Homeland Security, isn't going to stay in the garage when some other emergency happens. I am also concerned that if we have purchased specialized equipment that people are being trained to use it. That somebody can certify that we have receive the equipment and that we have people trained, that the commission can feel good that the response capability we funded will come into play should it be called upon. And I'm not suggesting that that doesn't exist, I don't know. So I think the LEPC's should make sure that what they fund is on the assessment list, meets their needs, on the approved equipment list the federal government provides, and they meet the overall state strategy. I think those are areas that the LEPC does now, I'm not saying they don't do that. I'm just saying I agree with everybody, I think we need to put this in writing, so that everybody has a clear expectation. I'm thinking along with Dr. Carrison, I agree with him, there needs to be a report. Somebody, who says, "Hey, yeah. We got this equipment and we have enhanced our capabilities and the safety of the residents of Nevada. I don't care where they are, that includes tribal lands, cities, counties, you know, whoever got the money. That's my overall comment.

Dr. Carrison, "Chuc, absolutely, I don't want everybody coming before the commission. I just think you need to have a report documenting what you did with it and how it benefited us.

Mr. Hadfield, "Kimberly.

Ms McDonald, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the reports should go through the LEPC as well, so that way it is congruent on both sides of the process. Then, that in turn would be submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Hadfield, "Now that I have pontificated and others have indicated their thoughts, how about the people that administer the program on our behalf. Do you have any comments?

Ms Carmazzi, "first of all I want to clarify, at this point right now, we are operating under the assumption that there will be a \$25,000 base plus population, is that correct?

Mr. Hadfield, "we will do a specific motion. Well, if we don't change the funding, Glade, we don't need to take a motion, right? No we

do need to do it, because we did it for one year last time. So we will have a formal motion on that for you. And if it's the pleasure of the committee to do that now, I would take that motion.

Ms Carmazzi, "Staff would further like to suggest that maybe what we could do is, obviously in the absence of not understanding what our funding amounts are going to be or what they are going to look like, we know that we had three different pots of money under the state Homeland Security Program, with the UASI [Urban Area Security Initiative] grant separately. Not knowing whether that is what it is going to look like this year, as it follows history it will look nothing like that, for the next funding cycle. What we would like to suggest, perhaps, in the meantime we can gather these reports, or we can set a format and run them through at least a couple of you just for review, to make sure it is meeting what type of information you are looking for. We could collect that and call a special meeting, once we have a better can clearer understanding what the funding is going to look like. Because, in sharing what the Sheriff's concern was, you know, on how he wants this risk assessment funded. I think it would be good to know that.

Mr. Hadfield, "We have a question, Kamala.

Dr. Carrison, "Are you responsible for all the DHS monies that come into this state? Are there Department of Homeland Security funds that come into Nevada in significant amounts that don't go through you?

Ms Carmazzi, "Not at this time.

Dr. Carrison, "There is no CDC grants that come from DHS?

Mr. Siracusa, "Mr. Chairman, yes, that is an issue we did want to bring up. We're bringing to the table the Homeland Security Monies from the Office of Domestic Preparedness for distribution to the state. There is also another substantial pot of money that comes into the state through CDC [Center for Disease Control] to the State Health Department. I believe this year it's about \$11.5 million. Those dollars, and how those dollars are distributed and where they go, it's our feeling that should also come before this body. Because, to get a full comprehensive picture of the state of the state, the monies coming in and where they go, to avoid duplication of effort, it's important that you folks have the big picture and look at all the dollars that are coming in.

Dr. Carrison, "That was my concern. Because I have been given information that there were significant amounts, and that confirms the significant amounts. Over 11 million dollars is a significant amount of money, and I think as the Chairman of the Nevada Homeland Security Commission, I'd like to know how those monies are being spent. Are there duplications? I would have to ask Glade, specifically, is it his legal opinion that that comes under this commission.

Mr. Myler, "Dr. Carrison, I had always maintained that and had lobbied with prior administrators at Public Health, that they put it under this, but they chose to do otherwise. So, yes, I agree.

Ms McDonald, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And moreover, perhaps that should be one of our other legislative proposals that all DHS and any funding having to do with Homeland Security definitely go through the Commission.

Mr. Hadfield, "Chuc, do you have any comments on that particular aspect? Bringing all the fundings, recommending that?

Mr. Lowden, "No, not on that aspect.

Mr. Hadfield, "Anyone else? I don't want to get it where we are talking about different things. Can we deal with that we make a recommendation to the commission that all funding, including the CDC and DHS monies that come under the general category of Homeland Security ..?



Ms Carmazzi, "Yes, Mr. Chairman, if we could offer, that could actually be done by way of an executive order of the Governor.

Mr. Hadfield, "Well, we recommend to the full Commission that those monies be put under the purview of the Homeland Security Commission for purposes of better coordination, allocation of resources, for the public health and safety of the residents of Nevada. Is that something that this committee would like to do? If so, I would like a motion.

Mr. Lowden, "That is a motion I would make.

Ms McDonald, "Second.

Mr. Hadfield, "Any further discussion on that? [pause] All those in favor signify by saying 'Aye'. [many 'Aye's heard] Opposed? [silence]. Hearing none the motion carries unanimously. -Now, I want to go back to the funding. I raised the issue of, first of all I think I heard everyone say we will utilize the same formula that we used for the current round of funding. But I raised the question about, you know we may have \$35,000 to do an assessment; we may have \$125,000 of left over money. We may have \$20,000 and we may not get an extension. I want to leave the door open; I think we should, so that we can take money from the next round, to either, augment and finish off the job that needs to be done, so that we can use that assessment in the 06 funding cycle, or if necessary fund the whole thing. And again, I think it should come across the board, and I just throw that out. I would like a motion on the funding, specifically approval of the funding process, if we are going to do what we did last year, I need that motion.

Mr. Lowden, "Mr. Chairman, Chuc Lowden, again. I hear a couple of things in the motion. Maybe I am missing something. One of the things I am hearing you ask for is support for a statewide threat assessment. If that's the motion that you want certainly I am prepare to make that. When you talk about using the same funding that we used for last year I'm a little bit uncomfortable with that only because we may get \$1 million this year, or we may get \$30 million to distribute. Restricting local agencies to a set amount of \$25,000 or granting up to \$25,000 is something that I would certainly like to see the Commission decide, or this board decide with finality when we have some numbers to deal with, rather than just arbitrarily and capriciously today.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you, Chuc. I appreciate you bringing that back to my attention. What I thought I heard was we would do this, but subject to a meeting when we find out specifically, from the Federal Government, what's going to happen we would then have the latitude to change it then. But I don't know, ...you can't send out that application until you know what the Federal funding is. This group, you need to decided whether or not you, as Chuc indicated, you need specific direction on the funding now, subject to the potential to coming back in a special meeting and changing it. Or I guess you could say, well we won't make a decision now, we'll wait until we have a special meeting when we know what the funding is.

Mr. Siracusa, "Mr. Chairman. I think we do need a special meeting, and also the concern also is, when we do get a notice of availability of funds and notice of grant award the clock will start ticking and we've got to act very, very quickly. I would suggest that once we get some indication, probably with availability, not with the availability when the feds were saying, 'this is what looks like Nevada is going to get and all the other states.' I think at that point, we need to very, very quickly call a meeting so these decisions can be made, because once the official grant award is issued then that clock starts ticking and we don't want to bog down a couple of weeks in this process and cut back on that 60 day period.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thanks, Frank. Jim you have a comment?"

Mr. Spinello, "Just that, this issue about an automatic amount for all, and I certainly believe that all have needs. But, I think as we are now looking at trying to prioritize in the future based on threat, we will need to revisit the notion of an automatic amount. I would like to keep that piece as an option based on special needs and we know more what's there. Having said that, even if we did, to me, in a sense that \$25,000 or some minimum, whatever it is, is a bit just like throwing money at things. It's really not addressing threat. It's really not addressing the prioritization. It's kind of saying to everybody, 'here's something for you,' and I think we need to get away from that. I know that's a bit north/south politics that that gets a little bit provocative, but I think it's gotta be on the table.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you, Jim. I think we are all in agreement, once we have the assessment we can then shift over to figuring out how to meet the needs that the assessment identifies. The problem I see is that we don't know when that's going to happen. The other thing is that some of the entities that may have a legitimate need without some kicker don't get enough money to do anything at all by population. If I had my way, regionalization should be an added criteria and encourage the smaller entities, along the I-80 corridor, and 95/93 corridor, to regionalize their resources. I certainly don't want to be equipping bomb squads next to each other etcetera, etcetera. It's a difficult and complex issue, I agree with you, but either way you do it there is always some unique situation. Franks now made the recommendation that you essentially, I believe, we hold a special meeting. And I guess if we were to do that, perhaps the same day as the Commission meeting, we meet in the morning and the Commission meeting the afternoon, we could come up with whatever formula we are going to use when we know what the money is.

Dr. Carrison, "The difficulty is about that is the time now to get the meeting scheduled for the full Commission, that will be done. We don't know, and we can't time that and know that the timing will be the same. I think what Frank and Kamala are saying, once that distribution comes up we need to get it out of everybody and we just...you know this just doesn't have to be a three or four hour meeting. All we have to do is the primary focus. We just come in and set up the primary method of funding formula, period. That would be the only thing, we don't have to spend an entire day doing that, unless it becomes contentious. We can't make that decision until we know what's available.

Mr. Hadfield, "We have a comment. Please, introduce yourself for the record.

Mr. Cyphers, "Mike Cyphers, Emergency Management, City of Henderson. Just a thought, to help the process along. Perhaps as a motion you might say that, 'If our funding level this year is at or above what it was last year, you go with the population + \$25,000 formula. If it is less, then you have to hold your special meeting.' It might save you a special meeting.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. What is the pleasure of the committee?"

Mr. Lowden, "I will make a motion?"

Mr. Hadfield, "OK, Chuc.

Mr. Lowden, "My motion is that DEM continue with the population based distribution of funding. Any specific changes to the current funding process be considered at a special meeting of the Finance Committee at such time as we have a tentative direction from the Federal Government of what the volume of grant funding will be this coming year.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Do I have a second?

Dr. Carrison, "I'll second that.

Mr. Hadfield, "Under discussion, any comments on the motion? Any public comment on the motion? [pause] Seeing none, I will call for vote, all those in favor vote by saying 'Aye.' [many voices]. Opposed? [silence] Hearing none, the motion carries unanimously. We have another item here that talks about reports. We've had a lot of discussion about reports, and we have said we want reports. I think we have pretty much articulated what they needed. Are there other considerations under Item 'b' Other Jurisdiction Reporting Requirements that need to be brought to our attention that we have not already addressed?

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, just real quickly, in the interest of saving time here. The jurisdictional reporting requirements are some of our concerns right now are that we have provided all of our sub-grantees with 30 day reporting requirements following the end of a quarter and 60 days after the end of a performance period. Along with that they are supposed to be accompanied with a program report. Just food for thought right now, obviously we can address a lot of the more definite details as to what the commission wishes to do in the coming years at a special meeting. One of the things we are running into is lack of timeliness on these reports. We have some as late as 60 days, when they are due in 30, and that is creating a little bit of hardship on us right now. Perhaps, if we can work together we can provide some policies how we want to address that. Further, we have actually had some instances, we're handling them at this point as best we can, where we've had refusals to provide attachments of supporting documents on quarterly re-imbursement claims.

Mr. Hadfield, "I believe Dr. Carrison has a solution.

Dr. Carrison, "I would like a recommendation from the Finance committee to go to the full Commission, that no report, no 05 funds. End of story. You got money from the state, you had obligations and requirements to get those monies and if you don't complete those obligations and requirements then we are certainly under no obligation to provide you more money. I would move that if reporting requirement are not met then there will be no distribution to 05 funds to those entities that meet their reporting requirements.

Mr. Hadfield, "Do I have a second?

Ms McDonald, "Second.

Mr. Hadfield, "Discussion. Glade?

Mr. Myler, "I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your concerns, but that is called a forfeiture, the law abhors forfeitures. What that means is that if someone misses a little technicality, misses a deadline, and you say you are not longer eligible for funds in 05 you are going to generate quite a bit of litigation and I don't think it would hold up.

Dr. Carrison, "I'm not... let me ask you this? If you have a grant process and that grant process specifically spells out the requirements that you as an entity have to meet to obtain those funds. If you do not complete the requirements of that grant then why is there...I'm not talking about something 10 days late. I'm talking about Ms Carmazzi has given an example where someone has refused to provide the information about what it was spent for.

Mr. Myler. "That I can understand. I'm saying if you make a hard and fast rule you've got to allow for reasonable extensions.

Ms Carmazzi, "Glade, if I may. We do all make sure that all sub-grantees sign assurances. That is their contract with us to provide these documents within the specified timeframes. Does that matter?

Mr. Myler, "I can guarantee that a court will not make them hold up to those assurances. From the common law cases that I have read about before a jury, it would be very difficult.

Dr. Carrison, "what if we say something like, 'that we will consider in the next application process for grant cycle, whatever that we are funding, that past performance of grant requirements will be considered in giving those grants?' Can I consider that? Because there is no legal requirement that I have to give you money. I can make recommendations, this body can make recommendations to the Governor about how funds are distributed and I could certainly consider the fact that a municipality has not completed their contract that they made when we gave them money. One, they didn't buy what they said they were going to buy, two they haven't given us the report to show what they spent their money on. I believe it would be reasonable for the Commission to consider that before giving them another grant.

Mr. Myler, "I'm not trying to say that you can't do it, because you can do it. What I'm trying to give you is the other side. I have to be a devil's advocate sometimes. But, I would think that whatever you do if it appears reasonable the court will uphold you. So if it is something that is not hard and fast and capricious, you will be OK, but if it's, you know if there is some wiggle room there, then your're going to be OK.

Sheriff Young, "I agree with Dr. Carrison. If they can't get the report done, I doubt seriously that they will have the wherewithal to file a law suite. So, Dr. Carrison has made a good motion.

Mr. Hadfield, "Can I suggest that we amend the motion, to say that we recommend the Commission give the strongest consideration to compliance with existing grant guidelines prior to granting new funds. Is that wiggle room enough?

Mr. Myler, "I think that is a good suggestion. What I suggest is that it is a process that leads to a hard and fast rule. What I am saying is. 'this year we are going to give strong admonition. Next year if you miss it, you are out. That would be much better as far as I am concerned. In other words you go to a two-step process. Like they call in personnel, it is progressive discipline.

Mr. Hadfield, "Will the maker and second make a motion to agree to that minor change. Clearly our attitude will be such that we will be delineated.

Dr. Carrison, "I accept the amendment. It needs to be made to work. We need accountability. These are funds that are very important resources for our state because they are for the health and safety of the citizens of Nevada and if they are being abused or not being handled appropriately it certainly would come under the purview of us to encourage those people to do it appropriately.

Mr. Hadfield, "Does the second agree on that?

Ms McDonald, "Yes, I agree, so moved.

Mr. Hadfield, "Before I call for a vote, as an individual member I expect sovereign nations to comply with the same guidelines as everyone else. Period. Does anybody disagree? I'll call for any further discussion on the motion? I'll call for the vote. All those in favor vote by saying 'Aye.' [many voices] Opposed? [none] Hearing none the motion carries unanimously.

Mr. Hadfield, "I want to thank everybody for hanging in there. Next item Federal Reporting requirements.

Ms Carmazzi, "Mr. Chairman, item 'c' under item 8 is very easy; strictly informational. Almost everybody who was involved with the Finance Committee prior to its modification are painfully aware of us using the term ISEP. We just want to let this body be aware of the fact

that that long, painstaking process, and all the training that went with it is now obsolete, by the Federal Government. We now have what we call a BISR, which is the Budget Implementation Spending Report. Just to make you aware, so when you hear that term, we've had that modification.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you for sharing that with us. Is there any other business under Item number eight? [no responses heard] Moving down to Item number nine, Other Committee Business; I'm not aware of any, did we miss anything? Chuc, did we miss anything? [Mr. Lowden motioned no, on the video screen] He gives up, he surrendered.

#### **Item No 10. Public Comment.**

Mr. Hadfield. "We will move, now, to item number 10, Public Comment. This is the time on the agenda when we invite the public to make any comment they wish to make. We cannot take any action on these comments. We can consider placing them on future agendas for action. I would ask that those who wish to make comments, come forward and state your name for the record, and we welcome the comments.

Mr. Tim McAndrew, City of Las Vegas Emergency Management, "Thank you. My up front promise is brevity. Earlier in the year... let me first start by saying, Chief Siracusa referenced, in one of his initial reports this morning, as task force that Secretary Ridge commissioned relative to researching all the funding issues and distribution issues, and quite frankly, what was the cause of delays in getting monies out to local first responders where it was needed. In March Secretary Ridge commissioned that task force that was given a very specific life span, not one of these deals where they would linger around for any length of time. Ninety days later in June they submitted their final report and they went away. The report has been filed with the Department of Homeland Security and it was released in early July publically. I acquired an electronic version and I requested through staff that be distributed at least to the Finance Committee members that were seated at that time, presumably some of you may have got that. I thought that since there had been changes to the makeup of the Finance committee membership I would like to submit to you today, I'll submit it to the clerk, that report. I think it is very important and it will be interesting, although long, and necessary read for persons in your position dealing with these matters, not just to read, but to comprehensively under the recommendations of the task force. As I read it, and what I wanted to state for the record, is I believe, there are many, many recommendations in here, but I think there are four that are overarching themes, if you will. That is, that as much as we would like to believe and blame the Federal Government that they are the sole cause in all the delays and misery, that the findings of the task force was that there really is no single point of failure here. Each level of government has inherent delays that contributed to this, as well as you have discussed this morning, vendor delays are entirely outside of our ability to change. The second finding was that, and it's a cry, if you will, to all government to urgently seek out and eliminate the choke points. That is their adjective, not mine, although it is one that I would use. See out and destroy, if you will, the choke points, the bureaucracy that is in every level of government that is unnecessary. It acknowledges that there is an administrative needs to ensure accountability, yada, yada, yada, but there are clearly levels of bureaucracy that are unnecessary and cause delays. The third overarching theme is that there should be a greater consideration to funding preventative measures and law enforcement measures, which is a mantra that Sheriff Young has been highlighting, since he has been on

the Commission. And then the fourth is a greater consideration to the use of emergency spending provisions. What they suggest here is that we aren't buying lawn mowers for the parks and recreation division of the cities. We are buying very specialized equipment for public safety personnel to be able to protect it citizenry and that we really should utilize those to the extent allowable by law. Maybe there are times when in the past that we had some items that we purchased items when we could have used those provisions, but did not. So, that is one of the overarching suggestions that you should consider here. I know this much, and I'll close. The City of Las Vegas has taken this report to heart. We have put together an internal taskforce to begin looking at our own issues and we have some. We're actually going to try to use this as a guide to do exactly what they say and eliminate that administrivia and the chokepoints that we have in our own system. We hope that because we are kinda at the bottom of the food chain here, we'll be limited to only those [chokepoints] that above us in terms of our success rate. I will file this with the clerk and I urge each to take this.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Dr. Carrison?"

Dr. Carrison, "I appreciate your comments very much and the report is obviously very important. My concern as a physician, and having no hospital representation, until the Commission was reorganized, as we now have Mr. Welch of the Nevada Hospital Association. There is no question in my mind, with a background in police and fire, how important that first responders use prevention first. We are still not giving National consideration to, as you just heard that report, National reports are still not giving consideration to what we do with victims of an incident. This is emergency hazard management. Whether the building collapses because a terrorist blew it up or because it had a faulty design, or because there was an earthquake. The response is there and we do the greatest job we have, and in Clark County at this time there is no surge capacity in the hospitals, and if you have two or three hundred people, which is not many, that have to receive emergency care immediately, there is no plan. You can say there is a plan, we practiced it, but in reality there are multiple patients in the emergency waiting rooms, 40 & 50 people a day with multiple people in the hallways. As my role as Chairman of the Commission we need to get the hospitals involved with everybody else, as the last link in the chain, to provide the best care for the health and safety, again, of the citizens in Nevada. Thank you for my pontification.

Mr. Hadfield, "Thank you. Are there further public comments? Here in Las Vegas, any further public comment? Chuc, do we have anyone up in Carson City?"

Mr. Lowden, "No one in Carson.

Mr. Hadfield, "Glade.

Mr. Myler, "Just one last comment. In regards to what Tim McAndrew was saying about the DHS Advisory Council taskforce. Even though that taskforce has been disbanded at this point, Mike Mairon, who is their secretary, assured me that if we have any concerns about funding from the Federal Government, we should contact him. So we will consider that.

Mr. Hadfield, "Before we adjourn, I would like to thank Giles for coming down to be present during the meeting. Frank, Kamala. Gwen, appreciate you hanging in there with us. And I certainly appreciate the members of the committee. I know there has been a significant change. I hope that you will notice in the future that all materials possible will be available to you well before the meeting, I appreciate your

patience today. I thank all of you for your service. Unless there are any comments by committee members, the meeting is adjourned. [ended at 12:18:45 PM]